HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

W.P. No. 427 of 2003

Petitioners	1.	Rajendra Kumar Verma aged about 42 years, S/o Late Motilal Verma Occupation-Sub Engineer Mahanadi Reservoir Project Face II Works Division Irrigation Project Sub-Division Arang, District Raipur (C.G.)
	2.	Jitendra Swaroop Pathak aged about 42 years, S/o Late Rajaram Pathak Occupation Sub-Engineer Mahanadi Reservoir Project Face II Works Division Irrigation Project Sub-Division Arang, District Raipur (C.G.)
	Versus	
Respondents	1.	State of Chhattisgarh through Secretary, Department of Water Resources, D.K.S. Bhavan Mantralaya, Raipur (C.G.)
	2.	Engineer in chief, Department of Water Resources, Government of Chhattisgarh, Civil Lines, Raipur (C.G.))
	3.	Executive Engineer, Mahanadi Reservoir Project Face II Works Division Raipur, District-Raipur (C.G.)
	4.	Sub Divisional Officer Irrigation Project Sub Division Arang-Raipur (C.G.)
	5.	Sri T.R. Nayak aged about Not known S/o Not Known
	6.	R.L. Sao aged about Not Known S/o Not Known
	7.	V.K. Chhivane aged Not Known S/o Not Known
	8.	P.K.S. Parihar aged about Not Known S/o Not Known
	9.	C.P. Vyas aged about Not Known S/o Not Known
	10.	P.R. Katolkar aged about Not Known S/o Not Known
	11.	R.K. Mandraha aged about Not Known S/o Not Known
	12.	D.K. Arya aged about Not Known S/o Not Known

Respondent No.5 to 12 all Posting address of Sub Divisional Officer Irrigation Project Sub Division Arang (Raipur) (C.G.)

Shri Jitendra Pali, Advocate for the petitioners.

Shri Pankaj Shrivastava, Panel lawyer for the Respondents No. 1 to 4.

45

ORAL ORDER

(2nd February, 2006)

The following order of the Court was passed by **Satish K. Agnihotri, J.**

1. The petitioners who are Sub Engineers working in the Irrigation Department were transferred by the impugned order dated 20.12.2002.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that with the passage of time the petition has become infructuous, to which learned counsel for the Respondents No. 1 to 4 have no objection. In the facts of the case the respondents/authorities are directed not to insist upon compliance of the impugned transfer order.

3. The petition is dismissed having become infructuous. No order as to costs.

Sd/-
Satish K. Agnihotri
Judge

Thakur